



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOME NOTES ON *MANKIND*

DATE

In my dissertation on *Some English and Latin Sources and Parallels for the Morality of Wisdom*,¹ I pointed out that the probable date of composition of *Mankind* was 1465-74. The earlier limit of this period is determined by the reference in the play to "rede reyallys" (l. 458); gold royals were first coined in England in 1465, and as the first mention of them in the *New English Dictionary* is under the year 1473, it is probable that foreign royals were not much in use before this date. The later limit, 1474, is fixed by the inscription at the end of the play, "O liber, si quis cui constas forte queretur, Hyngham quem monacho dices, super omnia consta[s]." This Monk Hyngham I identified with Richard Hengham (p. 86), who became abbot of St. Edmundsbury Abbey in 1474, and who would, therefore, not designate himself as plain "monk" after that date.

It is now possible, I think, to fix the date more exactly than 1465-74. The heading of the record of the mock court (ll. 680-86) reads:

"Curia tenta generalis,"

In a place þer goode ale ys,

Anno regni regitalis

Edwardi millateni [MS nullateni].

On ȝestern day, in Feuerere, þe ȝere passyth fully.

As Nought hath wrytyn; here ys owur tulli,

Anno regni regis nulli.

This seems to me to point to the period between October, 1470, when Edward IV fled from England, leaving the kingdom in possession of his rival, Henry VI, and April, 1471, when Edward regained the throne. During this time the question of who was king was in debate, and the expressions "Edwardi nullateni" and "anno regni regis nulli" are particularly appropriate.

This period between October and April fits the references to time in the play. Mr. Pollard thinks that the play was "written for performance at Christmas, or at least in the winter"; and for

¹ W. K. Smart, *Some English and Latin Sources for the Morality of Wisdom*, pp. 87 ff., and footnote, p. 89. (Menasha, Wis.: George Banta Publishing Co.)

proof he cites the following passages: Mankind's statement that he will sow his corn "at wyntur" (l. 539); and the allusions to a "wyntur corn-thresher" (l. 54), to the "Crystemes songe" (l. 325), to the cold weather (l. 316), and to football (l. 725).¹ If by the phrase "at Christmas, or at least in the winter," Mr. Pollard means "in midwinter" (and that seems to be his implied meaning), his conclusion is not warranted by the evidence in the play, for this evidence points to very late winter or early spring as the time of performance.

Some points not mentioned by Mr. Pollard need first to be examined. In the first place, the incident of digging with a spade and preparing for the sowing of the corn suggests that the play was given in one of the two seasons for breaking the ground and planting the grain—either in the autumn or in the early spring. Of these two, the evidence is all in favor of the spring season, which commonly lasted from Candlemas (February 2) to Easter.² The most definite reference to time in the play is in l. 684: "On ȝestern day, in Feuerere." This expression forms part of the mock heading for the proceedings of the court of Myscheff; but it is reasonable to suppose that the reference is to the current month, rather than to a remote one. Other considerations point to the latter part of this month. Thus, in l. 314, Mankind, after discussing with Mercy the conflict between his body and soul, fortifies himself against the assaults of his enemies by "titling" in his paper the words, "Memento, homo, quod cinis es, & in cinerem reuerteris." This was the central text of the services for Ash Wednesday, being pronounced by the priest at the time of the sprinkling of the ashes; it embodied the thought which the church intended should be carried into Lent.³ The play, of course, was not performed on Ash Wednesday, which was naturally not a day for the giving of plays; but the use of this text suggests a relation with the season just preceding Lent. Moreover, the general tone of *Mankind* is what we would expect in a play given in this time of festivity, which reached its climax in the boisterous gaiety of Shrove Tuesday.⁴ Now, in 1471 this season fell in

¹ *Macro Plays*, Introduction, p. xlii.

² N. J. Hone, *The Manor and Manorial Records*, p. 81.

³ Brand, *Popular Antiquities* (1890), I, 94.

⁴ For a description of the festivities of the pre-Lenten season, and especially of Shrove Tuesday, see Brand, *op. cit.*, I, 64 ff.; R. Chambers, *The Book of Days* (1886), I, 236 ff.; and W. Hone, *The Every Day Book*, I, 123 ff.

the latter part of February, for in that year the date of Shrove Tuesday was February 26; that is, Lent began on February 27. The reference in l. 802 to "sent Dauy" is also worth noting. It may be only a coincidence, but St. David's "day" is March 1, which, in 1471, was only three days after Shrove Tuesday.

It remains to see how this time agrees with the allusions which Mr. Pollard cites as pointing to a winter performance. The allusion to football (l. 725) is particularly appropriate for this period. This game was commonly a part of the Shrove Tuesday celebrations;¹ in fact, Shrove Tuesday was sometimes called "Football Day."² Also, the comment on the coldness of the weather (l. 316) is certainly not inappropriate for the last of February in England. Again, when Myscheff says in l. 54 that he has hired out as a "wyntur corn-thresher," he is making a joking allusion to his present idleness—he will work next winter. The point of the joke lies in the fact that it is now *not* winter, that is, midwinter, the season when the threshing was done; and the point is emphasized by postponing for almost a year the time when he will work. Mankind's statement (l. 539) that he will sow his corn "at wyntur" means that he will wait until the fall seeding time; he is disgusted with the difficulties of sowing in the present spring season. Mr. Pollard also suggests this as a possible meaning. Finally, Now-a-days calls his song a "Crystemes song" (l. 325), not because it was sung at Christmas, but because the name suggested to the audience a common type of song that was very different in subject-matter from the ribald selection in the play and thus emphasized the obscenity of the latter. Thus none of these allusions contradicts our conclusion that the play was intended for performance in the latter part of February, and all but two (those to cold weather and to the Christmas song) are more appropriate for this time than for midwinter. All these facts taken together form a convincing body of evidence in favor of the conclusion that *Mankind* was written for performance in Shrovetide in 1471. The tone of the play is entirely in keeping with the spirit of that season, and moreover we know that plays were sometimes given at that time.³

¹ E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage*, I, 149-50; R. Chambers, *op. cit.*, I, 237-38.

² W. Hone, *The Every Day Book*, I, 123.

³ Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, I, 65.

MEN NAMED IN THE PLAY

In ll. 498–508 New-gyse, Now-a-days, and Nought, who have been sent out to pillage the neighboring country, name six men whom they will visit, and three whom they will avoid.

Master Alyngton of Botysam.—The most prominent man in this list is “Master Alyngton of Botysam.” The Allingtons of Bottisham, Cambridgeshire, were descended from Sir Hildebrand de Alington, under-marshal to William the Conqueror at Hastings; and various succeeding members of the family held positions of prominence in England.¹ One of these was the William Allington who was living in Bottisham at the time of our play.²

The date of his birth is not known; the first notice we have of him is that of his marriage to Joan Ansty, in 1457, recorded in the bishop’s register at Ely. From July 4, 1461, to November 18, 1468, he was nine times a member of the commission of the peace (a justice of the peace) for the county.³ As these nine commissions are the only ones recorded in the *Patent Rolls* for this period, he apparently served continuously in this office. His name does not appear on the commission for December 14, 1470, the next one recorded, but he was again a member of the following one, for December 10, 1473.⁴ From July 11, 1461, to October 28, 1473, he was on six commissions of the peace for the town of Cambridge.⁵ William Allington, then, was closely connected with the administration of justice in the county of Cambridge. This explains why Nought, who intends to rob other men, decides to “spare Master Alyngton” (l. 507).

On December 1, 1461, and February 3, 1462, Allington was appointed on commissions to consider a complaint of the prior of Bernewell that the tenants of the manor of Chesterton, county of Cambridge, had thrown off their allegiance.⁶ On June 18, 1461, he,

¹ See the history of the family in Edward Hallstone, *History of the Parish of Bottisham*, in Cambridge Antiquarian Society Publications, Octavo Series, VII, 107–17. The genealogy of the family is also traced in Clutterbuck, *History of Hertfordshire*, II, 539 ff.; in A. R. Maddison, *Lincolnshire Pedigrees*, I, 4; in J. J. Howard, *The Visitation of Suffolke* (for 1561), II, 182; in J. W. Clay, *The Visitation of Cambridge*, pp. 14–17; and in “Sir T. P.,” *The Cambridgeshire Visitation* (for 1619), p. 2.

² His biography is given by Hallstone, pp. 111–13; the facts presented in this article are taken from Hallstone’s account, except where otherwise indicated.

³ *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1461–67), p. 560; (1467–77), p. 609.

⁴ *Ibid.* (1467–77), p. 609.

⁵ *Ibid.* (1461–67), p. 560; (1467–77), p. 609.

⁶ *Pat. Rolls* (1461–67), p. 68.

with the chancellor of the University of Cambridge, and others, was appointed to inquire into the obstruction of the river which had caused the great bridge of the town of Cambridge to be broken down.¹ On March 12, 1462, he was one of a commission to act upon the release of certain property by one of the Cambridge colleges to a convent.² On March 17, 1468, he, John Allington, and others were appointed to inquire into the escape of prisoners from certain prisons in Cambridgeshire.³ On May 11, 1471, and March 7, 1472, he was a member of commissions of array for the county of Cambridge.⁴

Thus far Allington's activities had been confined to his home county. He had been preparing himself for the higher honors to come. In 1472 he was a member of Parliament from Cambridgeshire, and was elected speaker of the House of Commons. In 1475 he built a chapel at Bottisham, for the welfare of his soul and that of Joan, his wife. In 1476 he was made a knight of the shire. In 1478 he was again a member of Parliament and was again elected speaker. In 1479 he was appointed a member of the Privy Council.⁵ He died in 1479, without issue, and was buried in Bottisham church.⁶

Master Woode of Fullburn.—Burke⁷ says that the family of Wood, which at the time of his writing belonged to Middlesex County, is one of antiquity, and is mentioned in the Court Rolls in the Manor of Fulbourne in 1367. Alexander Wood, of Fulbourne, county of Cambridge, died on December 5, 1479. His son, John Wood, also of Fulbourne, married Elizabeth, widow of Nicholas Hylton, burgess of Cambridge; he died on July 2, 1520. *The Cambridgeshire Visitation* (of 1619), edited by "Sir T. P.," p. 34, also gives a genealogy of the family, beginning with this John Wood.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

² *Ibid.*, p. 177.

³ *Ibid.* (1467-77), p. 101.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 285 and 349. These entries in the *Patent Rolls* do not give the place of residence of the William Allington named; but there can be no doubt that he was the Bottisham man. He was the only William Allington in Cambridgeshire who fits in with the dates. He had no son; William, his father, died in 1459; and William, his nephew, was born about 1449 (he was aged "31 years and upwards" when John Allington, his father, died, in 1480; see Clutterbuck, *History of Hertfordshire*, II, 540), and was therefore not old enough at the time of these entries to have held such responsible positions.

⁵ In 1478, according to *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1476-85), p. 142.

⁶ The facts in this paragraph are from Hallstone, pp. 111-13; I have, however, verified them all from the *Patent Rolls* and other sources. In the *Patent Rolls* there are a number of other references to this William Allington which have not been mentioned in this article. They may be found by consulting the indexes for the volumes between 1461 and 1479.

⁷ B. Burke, *Landed Gentry* (1906), p. 1842.

The Alexander Wood who died in 1479 is probably the man named in *Mankind*. His *inquisition post mortem*, dated 20 Edw. IV, shows that he had considerable property in Cambridgeshire.¹ He was a member of commissions of the peace for the town of Cambridge, appointed in 1471, 1473, and 1475;² and he served on like commissions for the county of Cambridge for 1473, 1475,³ and three for 1479.⁴ In 1473, he was made a member of a commission in the county of Cambridge to inquire into arrears in revenue to the king.⁵ In 1478, he served on two commissions appointed to inquire into the possessions of George, late Duke of Clarence, in Cambridgeshire, and to take them into the king's hands.⁶ On all these commissions, except the commission of the peace for June 4, 1479, he was associated with William Allington.

So far as I have been able to discover, Wood was not a justice of the peace in the spring of 1471, the date of our play; but he was appointed to that position in November of that year, and in the commissions noted above his name is associated with those of such men as William Allington, John Cheney, Thomas Lokton, and John Ansty, all of whom had served as justices of the peace for years before 1471 (see *Pat. Rolls*, index, under these names). This explains the remark of Now-a-days in ll. 504-5 of *Mankind*:

I xall spare master Woode of Fullburn;
he ys a "noli me tangere!"

That is to say, he is a man to be let alone. Wood was too closely associated with the administrators of justice to be preyed upon by one of a band of vagabond players. (Master Alyngton of Botysam, as we have seen, was to be "spared" for the same reason.)

The term "noli me tangere" is applied to Wrath, also a person to be avoided, in Lydgate's *Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*, l. 15607, where Wrath says:

My namë callyd in ech place
Ys thys, "Noli me tangere";

¹ *Calendarium Inquisitionum post Mortem* (1828), IV, 401. Although the Alexander Wood of the inquisition record is not expressly assigned to Fulbourne, he is identified with the subject of our sketch by the facts that both belonged to Cambridgeshire and that the date of the inquisition of one corresponds with the time of the death of the other.

² *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1467-77), p. 609.

³ *Ibid.* (1467-77), p. 406.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.* (1476-85), pp. 109, 111.

⁶ *Ibid.* (1476-85), p. 555.

ffor I haue "carmen et ve";
 Thys to seyne, (yiff yt be souht)
 Be war that thow touche me nouht.

In Gower's *Mirour de l'Omme*, ll. 1515 ff., Arrogance is called "Noli me tangere":

Car il ad celle enfermeté
 Que plus s'agregge par toucher;
 Et pour cela l'en solt nommer
 Le mal *Noli me tangere*.

The origin of the expression is, of course, Christ's admonition to Mary Magdalene when he appears to her after his resurrection (John 20:17).

Pycharde of Trumpington.—In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries a family of Pychards lived at Bottisham, Cambridgeshire. In 1279 John Pychard and Geoffrey Pychard held land in Bottisham of the Prior of Anglesey;¹ Richard Pychard held land here of John de Deresle;² and Geoffrey Pychard and Richard Pychard were tenants, in this place, of William de Robercot and Martin de Lada, respectively.³ In 1339 Richard Pychard was a juror in an *inquisition ad quod damnum* held at Bottisham.⁴ In 1341 the name of Richard Pichard appears in an inquisition, held at the same place, concerning taxes.⁵

Concerning this family of Pychards of Bottisham, Mr. Hailstone says that "it is exceedingly probable that they were the ancestors of the family of the same name, who afterwards resided at Trumpington";⁶ but he cites no references to the latter place of a date earlier than the middle of the sixteenth century.

There were, however, Pychards in Trumpington at the time of our play. In the accounts of the Priory of St. Radegund, Cambridgeshire, for 1449–50, appears the name of Johannes Pichard de Trumpington;⁷ in the accounts for 1450–51, the name of Pycchard de Trumpington;⁸ and in the accounts for 1481–82, the name of Willelmus Pychard, place of residence not given, but presumably

¹ Edward Hailstone, *History of the Parish of Bottisham*, in *Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, Octavo Series, VII, 233.

² *Ibid.*, p. 138. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 140. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 264. ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 273. ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 130.

⁷ Arthur Gray, *The Priory of Saint Radegund, Cambridge*, in *Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, Octavo Series, 1898, p. 146.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

Trumpington, as in the two preceding entries.¹ This is probably the "William Pychard of Cambridge, 'bocher,' alias of Trompyngton, 'bocher'" who is named in the *Patent Rolls* for 1489.² He or his father is probably the man named in *Mankind*.

Master Huntyngton of Sauston.—The following entries concerning the Huntingtons of Sawston are from *Feudal Aids* (1284–1431); all are for the hundred of Witlesford, in the county of Cambridge.

1302–3 A.D.: "De Radulfo de Huntendone et Dyonisia uxore ejus, Reginaldo de Durem et Hawysia uxore ejus pro di. f. in Saustone tento de rege, xx s." (I, 144.)

1346 A.D.: "De Hugone de Huntyngdone pro di. f. in Saustone tento de domino rege, quod quondam Radulphus Huntyngdone et Dionisia uxor ejus, Reginaldus de Durem et Hawisia uxor ejus tenuerunt de domino rege i. c., xx s." (I, 161.)

1428 A.D.: "Walterus Huntyngdone tenet di. f. m. in Saustone, quod Hugo de Huntyngdone quondam tenuit ibidem." (I, 181.)

Here we have three generations of the Huntingdons of Sawston. Unfortunately, I have not had access to the records of *Feudal Aids* for the years following 1428. Walter Huntingdon of the 1428 entry is perhaps the father of the Master Huntington of our play.

These entries prove that we should read "Sauston" instead of "Sanston" in l. 498 of the play. The former was Dr. Brandl's reading, and he was correct in his conjecture that it meant Sawston, Cambridgeshire.³ Dr. Furnivall, reading Sanston, suggested Santon, in Norfolk, as the place intended.⁴

Wyllyham Baker of Waltom.—In the *Calendar of Inquisitions post Mortem* for the reign of Henry VII, are a number of references to a William Baker connected with East Walton, Norfolk, which all the editors agree is the "Waltom" of *Mankind*.

From the inquisition of a William Baker, held on October 30, 1495, we learn that he died on March 12, 1491, and that by his last will he left to his "son and heir," John Baker, the Manor of Nether Halle in Hyllnyngton, Norfolk; to his son William he left the messuages of Newgates and Richowdes in *Est Walton*, West Acre, and

¹ Arthur Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

² *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1485–94), p. 274.

³ A. Brandl, *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England*, p. xxvi.

⁴ *Macro Plays*, p. 19, n. 3.

Ayleswythorp, Norfolk; and he directed that certain property in Grymston should be sold by his executors for the "benefit of his soul and the soul of Margery his wife."¹

The place of residence of this man is not given; but in the *Visitations of Norfolk*, ed. Walter Rye, p. 11, he is called William Baker of Westthorpe, in Suffolk. According to the latter record, William Baker of Westthorpe married Margery, daughter of ——— Hawis; and they had two sons—William Baker of Est Walton, Norfolk, and John Baker of Helington, Norfolk. He is evidently the William Baker of the *Inquisitions* entry, whose wife was named Margery, and who left property in Est Walton to his son William, and property in Hyllington to his son John. The connection of this man with Westthorpe is not clear. The *Inquisitions* record mentions no property in that place. He may have lived there at some time; but however that may be, we know that in 1491 he had property in East Walton.

He is the first member of the family named in the records that I have seen. His son is the first man in the available family history to be called definitely William Baker "of Est Walton." This son, however, cannot be the man referred to in *Mankind*, for his *elder* brother, John, was aged "30 and more" at the time of the inquisition (1495),² and was therefore only about six years old when the play was written. In the absence of any information about preceding members of the family, we therefore conclude that the William Baker who died in 1491 and who had property in East Walton is probably the "Wyllyham Baker of Walton" named in the play.

The name of William Baker of East Walton appears in three real estate transactions in the *Calendar of Inquisitions* of the reign of Henry VII. Simon Blake, who died in 1489, gave by his will certain property to William Baker of Est Walton.³ Roger Tounshend, who died in 1494, willed to his wife two pieces of land which he had bought of William Baker of Est Walton, "yeoman," and others.⁴ These entries are of such dates that they may refer either to our William Baker or to his son. The first is dated 1489, two years before the

¹ *Cal. Inq.* (Henry VII), I, 437.

² *Ibid.*, 437.

³ *Ibid.*, 225.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 490, 492.

father's death; the second is dated 1494, but we are not told how long before that time the land was bought of Baker.¹

Hamonde of Soffeham.—Dr. Furnivall identifies the Soffeham of l. 508 with Swaffham in Norfolk, situated about fourteen miles from Lynn. There is, however, a Swaffham Bulbek, sometimes called simply Swaffham, in Cambridgeshire, which from its geographical location is just as likely to be the place named in the play. Moreover, in the fifteenth century there were Hamonds in both of these localities.

In the *Patent Rolls* the name of Nicholas Hamond of Swaffham Bulbek, Cambridgeshire, appears in an entry for 1427;² and the name of Nicholas Hamond of Swofham, Cambridgeshire, in one for 1434.³ Again, in 1427 John Vyncent of Swaffham Bulbek, county of Cambridge, was cited for not appearing in court to answer Richard Hamond and William Bocher touching a plea of debt of five marks.⁴ In this entry Richard Hamond is not definitely associated with Swaffham Bulbek; but it is probable that he belonged there, as his debtor was a resident of that place, and there were Hamonds living there at that time.

A family of Hamonds is still (or was in 1906) connected with Swaffham in Norfolk. Burke says: "The family of Hamond is of considerable antiquity in Norfolk, and was settled formerly at South Wootton and Swaffham." The first of the line mentioned by him is Edmund Hamond, who died in 1605.⁵

In the *Black Book of Swaffham*, begun in 1454, among the list of dead benefactors of the church for whom prayers are to be said, is the following entry: "And of Raffe Hamonde, the which did the Cost of Stoling in the Trinity Chapell, and did make the Cofyr that stond in the Vestry to kepe the Tokys and Vestments, and also gaff to the edyfyng of the stepyll, xxxiii s. iiii d."⁶ The date of this entry is not certain. It is a part of a paragraph containing the names of a group of men, most of whom gave money for the

¹ I have references to the genealogy of the Baker family of Westthorp, in *Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and Natural History (Proceedings)*, VIII, 129, and Add. MS 19116; but I have not been able to consult them.

² *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1422-29), p. 446.

³ *Ibid.* (1429-36), p. 385.

⁴ *Ibid.* (1422-29), p. 366.

⁵ B. Burke, *The Landed Gentry of Great Britain* (1906), p. 764.

⁶ F. Blomefield, *History of Norfolk*, VI, 220.

new church and steeple. Blomefield says that the new church was begun in the time of John Botewright, rector, but was not completed till the reign of Henry VII, and the tower at the west end was not finished till 1510.¹ As Botewright was not rector after 1474,² the time of building was from before 1474 to 1510. The steeple was begun in 1507.³ In the group of names which includes that of Hamond are the names of John Angere, parson of Southacre, who paid for the glasoning of a window in the new church, and of Robert Copping, "late Parson of this Chirche" (i.e., Swaffham), who gave money for building the steeple. John Angere was rector of Southacre from 1452 to 1486.⁴ Copping succeeded Botewright as rector at Swaffham; and if Blomefield's list of rectors (p. 223) is complete he held this position from 1474 to 1495. From the data at hand we cannot get a more exact date than the last quarter of the fifteenth century for the entry concerning Raffe Hamond. Either he or his father is probably the Hamond of the play, if Dr. Furnivall is right in identifying Soffeham with the Norfolk Swaffham. As we shall see, however, it is by no means certain that this identification is correct.

Wylliam Thurlay of Hauston.—I have found nothing definite about the other men named in the play. The "Johannes Thyrlowe de Hawkeston," who is mentioned in the accounts of the Priory of St. Radegund, Cambridge, for 1450–51,⁵ may, however, be one of the family of Wylliam Thurlay of Hauston in l. 499 of the play. Hawkeston and Hauston are variant spellings for the modern Hauxton.

William Fyde(?).—In l. 496 of the play, there is, perhaps, the name of another man of the neighborhood. Dr. Furnivall's reading for this line is, "Take W[illiam] Fyde, yf ze wyll haue ony mo"; Professor Manly reads, "Take w[ith yow] Fyde," etc. In this connection it is worth noting that in 1450–51 a John Fydde lived in Waterbeach, a town situated about five miles northeast by north from Cambridge, in the vicinity where the play was given.⁶

¹ *Ibid.*, 216.² *Ibid.*, 223.³ *Ibid.*, 208.⁴ *Ibid.*, 85.⁵ Arthur Gray, *The Priory of Saint Radegund, Cambridge*, in *Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, Octavo Series, 1898, p. 163. These are the accounts that furnished most of our information concerning Pychard of Trumpington.⁶ Arthur Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

MISCELLANEOUS PASSAGES

In ll. 32-36, Christ is likened to the head and his saints to the members of the human body:

Se how þe hede, þe members dayly do magnyfe.
 Who ys þe hede, forsoth I xall yow certyfyf;
 I mene owur Sauyowur, þat was lykynnyde to a lambe;
 Ande hys sayntis be þe members þat dayly he doth satysfyf
 With þe precyose reuer þat runnyth from hys wombe.

This comparison, which occurs in several places in the Bible, is a favorite one with mediaeval writers. Cf. *Ayenbite of Inwyt*:

Þe zeuende scele is uor þet we byeþ alle lemes of one bodye. huerof Iesu crist is þet heaued / and we byeþ þe lemes. þet we libbeþ alle of onelepi mete. þet is of þe holy uless and of þe holy blod of Iesu crist þet ous zuo moche loueþ / and zuo moche halt ous worþ: þet he ous yefþ his blod to drinke / and his uless to etene.¹

Walter Hilton in his *Epistle on Mixed Life* elaborates the idea of the members:

Thou sall vndirstande þat oure lorde Ihesu Criste, as mane, es heuede of a gastely body, whilke es haly kirke. The membris of this body are all cristene mene. Some are armes, and some are fete, and some ere oþer membris aftire sundre wirkynges þat þay vse in thaire lyffynge.²

William of Shoreham adds a new comparison, of the priest with the mouth:

Crist hys þat heued, þe prest þe mouþe,
 Þe lymes þat folke i-vere.³

In l. 47, Myscheff remarks to Mercy:

Yowur wytt ys lytyll, yowur hede ys mekyll.

The proverb "A great head and a little wit" is recorded in Ray's collection.⁴ In the modern mumming plays, the Fool, Beelzebub, or some other character often enters with:

Here come I; ain't been yit,
 Big head and little wit.⁵

In ll. 49-52, Myscheff asks Mercy "pis questyon to claryfyf":

Dryff-draff, mysse-masche;
 Sume was corn, & sume was chaffe;
 My dame seyde my name was Raffe;
 On-schett yowur lokke, & take an halpenye.

¹ *Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyt*, ed. R. Morris (E. E. T. S.), p. 146.

C. Horstman, *Richard Rolle of Hampole*, I, 272.

² *The Poems of William of Shoreham*, ed. M. Konrath (E. E. T. S.), p. 23, ll. 622-23.

⁴ J. Ray, *A Collection of English Proverbs* (1742), p. 117.

⁵ E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage*, I, 215.

The third line contains a pun on the words "Ralph" (M. E. Raffe) and "raff." The *New English Dictionary* defines the latter as "worthless material, trash, refuse," and gives a quotation from *Palladius on Husbandrie* (ca. 1420), I, 827: "Take chaf & raf [L. *purgamenta*] And ley hit on thy lond. . . . And when thou sist the myst, let brenne vp chaf and raf." No doubt the words "chaf" and "raf" were frequently used together as in this passage from *Palladius*, and thus furnished a ready-made rhyme for the writer of *Mankind*. He, of course, uses "raff" in its most uncomplimentary sense. The passage in the play may have been written merely as a bit of doggerel rhyme, with no intention of giving it a logical meaning; it also suggests, however, a more definite idea. Mercy has previously said (l. 43) that at the Last Judgment there will be a strict examination of the human race, and a separation of the corn from the chaff. Thereupon Myscheff compares humanity to a misch-masch, a hotch-potch, of the good and the bad, the corn and the chaff. His wife, without waiting for the Last Verdict, has placed him among the chaff, or more specifically, the "raff."

In the expression, "On-schett yowur lokke" (l. 52), the same figure is used for "to talk, to speak" as in ll. 128-29:

Now opyn yowur sachell with Laten wordis,
Ande sey me þis in clerycall manere!

Cf. the common Old English expression "Word-hord onleac," as in *Beowulf*, l. 259, etc.

In ll. 72-73, New-gyse(?) directs the minstrels to play, and urges them to "ley on with pi ballys tyll hys bely breste." "Ballys" is not, I think, from O.F. *bal*, a dance, as Dr. Brandl suggests,¹ but is a form for "bellows" used here as a slang term for the bagpipe for the sake of the pun with "bely."² I have found no instance in which this instrument is specifically called a "bellows," but the comparison is a natural and obvious one. The word "bely" may either be a slang term for the bag of the pipe (another obvious comparison, as may be seen in the pictures of fourteenth century

¹ A. Brandl, *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare*, p. 652.

² According to the *New English Dictionary*, s.v. "belly," in early Middle English the form "bali" was used only for "belly," and the form "beli" for either "bellows" or "belly." However, "bales," with an *a*, is given for "bellows" in an entry dated 1523, s.v. "bellows."

bagpipes),¹ or may refer to the belly of Nought, who is to do the dancing, or the difficult part of it. The line thus means either "Blow till your bagpipe bursts," or "Play till the dancer's belly bursts." Either meaning would fit the context.

The dance that follows is a lively one. Now-a-days, New-gyse, and Nought all take part, but Nought has the most difficult rôle. He twice expresses the fear that he will break his neck, and after he has finished he declares that the place for dancing is a "narrow space." His performance was probably in the nature of an acrobatic exhibition, perhaps a rope dance. Dancing on a rope was, according to Strutt, a part of the entertainment given by minstrels and joculators as far back as the thirteenth century.²

L. 88, "A-non, of with yowur clothes, yf ȝe wyll pray," seems to have no meaning. Is "pray" a scribal error for "play"? The latter word makes good sense: Nought is trying to persuade Mercy to dance. A manuscript *l*, if carelessly extended below the line, could easily be taken for an *r*; see the facsimile of the text.

In ll. 149-52, just before leaving the stage Now-a-days says:

Cum wynde, cum reyn,
Thow I cumme neuer a-geyn!
ȝe deull put out both yowur eyen!
Felouse, go we hens tyght!

An expression similar to the one in the first two lines occurs also in connection with an exit in *Mundus et Infans*, l. 491. Conscience has been preaching to Manhode much as Mercy has been doing to the three scapegraces in *Mankind*; and as Conscience leaves Manhode says:

Yes, yes! Ye, come wynde and rayne,
God let hym neuer come here agayne!

That is to say: "Let wind, rain, and other discomforts come, if they must, but let me never meet this man again." In our play Now-a-days ironically gives expression to the thought that he knows is in Mercy's mind.

W. K. SMART

ARMOUR INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

[To be continued]

¹ Two pictures are given in F. W. Galpin, *Old English Instruments of Music*, p. 176.

² J. Strutt, *Sports and Pastimes of the People of England*, p. 302 (Chatto and Windus, 1898).